arXiv:hep-ph/0007331v1 28 Jul 2000

A Lorentz covariant approach to the bound state problem

L. Micu[1]

Department of Theoretical Physics
Horia Hulubei Institute for Physics and Nuclear Engineering
Bucharest POB MG-6, 76900 Romania

Abstract

The relativistic equivalent of the Schrödinger equation for a two particle bound state having the total angular momentum S is written in the form of a Lorentz covariant set of equations $(p_1^\mu + p_2^\mu + \Omega^\mu)\,\Psi(p_1, p_2; P)\chi_S(\vec{p}_1, \vec{p}_2) = P^\mu \Psi(p_1, p_2; P)\chi_S(\vec{p}_1, \vec{p}_2)$ where the operators Ω^μ are the components of a 4-vector quasipotential. The solution of this set is a stationary function representing the distribution of spins and internal momenta in a reference frame where the momentum of the bound system is P^μ.

The contribution of the operators Ω^μ to the bound state momentum is assumed to be the 4-momentum of a vacuum-like effective field entering the bound system as an independent component. It is shown that a state made of free quarks and of the effective field has definite mass and can be normalized like a single particle state.

The generalization to the case of three or more particles is immediate.

---

[1] E-mail address: lmicu@theor1.theory.nipne.ro

It is a well known fact that the bound state problem has a fully satisfactory description in classical quantum mechanics, but does not have a similar one in relativistic field theory.

In quantum mechanics the existence of a bound state is conditioned by the presence of a potential well which ensures the localizability of the wave function in the space of the relative coordinates. In this context the bound state wave function is stationary and normalizable.

In relativistic field theories the bound state is assumed to be the result of the continuous exchange of quanta between the constituents as it is formally expressed by the Bethe-Salpeter method [1]. The formalism is fully relativistic, but the number of constituents in the intermediate states of the iterative solution is indefinite.

It is almost obvious that the connection between the two schemes can be made only by assuming that the interacting potential in quantum mechanics is the effective, time averaged result of the continuous exchange of quanta. The difference between the two formalisms is clearly a difference of scale. One expects then for field theories to be more adequate for the treatment of high resolution processes occuring at high energy where the binding effects are negligible, while quantum mechanics to be suitable for the description of low resolution processes where the quantum fluctuations cannot be observed as such. It remains still to find a suitable approach for the bound state to be used in the treatment of low resolution relativistic processes, where the binding effects may be significant.

The approach we propose here is suitable for this last case. It is based on a covariant generalization of the time independent Schrödinger equation for a bound state. This is achieved by replacing the eigenvalue equation for the Hamiltonian of the bound system by a set of four eigenvalue equations for a 4-vector operator representing the sum of the internal 4-momenta and of a 4-vector interaction potential. The equations are written in momentum space and their solution are the distribution function of the internal spins and momenta. Lorentz covariance is manifestly satisfied and also is the mass shell constraint of the bound state momentum.

In the following we refer specifically to QCD and to the meson case as a quark-antiquark bound state. The generalization to three and more particles is briefly discussed. The colour indices shall be omitted for simplicity and the binding potential will be assumed to be white.

The equations to be satisfied by the distribution function of the internal momenta $\Psi_S(p_1, p_2; P)\chi_S(\vec{p}_1, \vec{p}_2)$ of a meson with spin S and momentum P with $P^2 = M^2$ are:

$$(\, p_1^\mu + p_2^\mu \; + \; \Omega^\mu) \, \Psi(p_1, p_2; P)\chi_S(\vec{p}_1, \vec{p}_2) \; = \; P^\mu \; \Psi(p_1, p_2; P)\chi_S(\vec{p}_1, \vec{p}_2) \qquad \mu = 0, 1, 2, 3 \quad (1)$$

where $p_{1,2}^\mu$ are the on mass shell momenta of the two quarks. The scalar function $\Psi(p_1, p_2; P)$ represents the distribution of the quark momenta and $\chi_S(\vec{p}_1, \vec{p}_2)$ is an expression involving Dirac spinors, γ matrices and quark momenta having suitable transformation properties. The operators Ω^μ behaving like the components of a 4-vector represent a relativistic generalization in momentum space of the interaction term and shall be called a generalized quasipotential.

The generic form of the operators Ω^μ can be written with the aid of the operators

$$i\nabla_{1,2}^\mu = i\frac{\partial}{\partial p_{1,2\mu}} - i\frac{1}{M^2}\left(P^\alpha \frac{\partial}{\partial p_{1,2}^\alpha}\right) \; P^\mu \qquad (2)$$

$$p^{T\mu}_{1,2} = p^{\mu}_{1,2} - \frac{1}{M^2}(P^{\alpha} p_{1,2\alpha})\ P^{\mu} \tag{3}$$

$$\Sigma^{\mu}_{1,2} \ = \ \frac{i}{M}\epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\mu} P_{\alpha}\gamma^{(1,2)}_{\beta}\gamma^{(1,2)}_{\gamma} \tag{4}$$

$$\Lambda^{\mu}_{1,2} \ = \ \frac{i}{M}\epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\mu} P^{\alpha} p^{\beta}_{1,2}\nabla^{\gamma}_{1,2} \tag{5}$$

representing the relativistic covariant generalizations of the position, momentum, spin and angular momentum in the rest frame of the meson. We have then:

$$\Omega^{\mu} = \frac{P^{\mu}}{M}\,\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_0 \ + \ [p^{T\mu}_1,\ \tilde{\mathcal{U}}_1]_+ \ + \ [p^{T\mu}_2,\ \tilde{\mathcal{U}}_2]_+ + i[\nabla^{\mu}_1,\ \tilde{\mathcal{V}}_1]_+ + i[\nabla^{\mu}_2,\ \tilde{\mathcal{V}}_2]_+ \tag{6}$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}$, $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}$ are scalar hermitian operators. We notice that $\mathcal{U}_{0,1,2}$ are even at time reversal, while $\mathcal{V}_{1,2}$ are odd.

In the rest frame of the meson the equations (1) take the form:

$$\left(\sqrt{\vec{p}_1^{\,2}+m_1^2} + \sqrt{\vec{p}_2^{\,2}+m_2^2} + \tilde{\mathcal{U}}_0\right)\Psi(p_1,p_2;M)\chi_S(\vec{p}_1,\vec{p}_2) = M\ \Psi(p_1,p_2;M)\chi_S(\vec{p}_1,\vec{p}_2) \tag{7}$$

$$\left(\vec{p}_1 + \vec{p}_2 + [\vec{p}_1,\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_1]_+ + [\vec{p}_2,\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_2]_+ + i[\nabla_1,\tilde{\mathcal{V}}_1]_+ + i[\nabla_2\ \tilde{\mathcal{V}}_2]_+\right)\Psi(\vec{p}_1,\vec{p}_2)\chi_S(\vec{p}_1,\vec{p}_2) = 0. \tag{8}$$

If $\vec{\Omega} = 0$ in this frame the solution of (8) reads

$$\Psi(p_1,p_2;M) \ = \ \delta^{(3)}(\vec{p}_1+\vec{p}_2)\ \psi(\vec{p})\chi_S(\vec{p}). \tag{9}$$

In addition, if $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_0$ depends on $\vec{p}_1 - \vec{p}_2$ only, in the nonrelativistic limit eq.(7) reduces to the Fourier transform of the usual Schrödinger equation for a bound state

$$(\frac{\vec{p}^{\,2}}{2\mu} \ + \ \tilde{\mathcal{U}}_0)\psi(\vec{p})\chi_S(\vec{p}) \ = \ (M - m_1 - m_2)\ \psi(\vec{p})\chi_S(\vec{p}), \tag{10}$$

where $\mu = \frac{m_1\ m_2}{m_1+m_2}$ is the reduced mass and $\vec{p} = \frac{1}{2}(\vec{p}_1 - \vec{p}_2)$ is half of the relative quark momentum in the rest frame of the bound state.

We notice also that the operators Λ_1 and Λ_2 are now replaced by the orbital angular momentum $\vec{L}$ of the relative motion

$$L_k \ = \ -\,i\epsilon_{ijk}p^i\ \nabla^j_p \tag{11}$$

and the spin-spin and the spin-orbit couplings are $\vec{\sigma}_{1,2}\cdot\vec{\sigma}_{1,2}$ and $\vec{\sigma}_{1,2}\cdot\vec{L}$ where σ_i are Pauli matrices.

Then, just like in quantum mechanics one can write the orthogonality relation for the solutions of the eigenvalue equation (10):

$$\int d^3p\ \psi_M(\vec{p})\ \psi^*_{M'}(\vec{p}) \ = \delta_{MM'}. \tag{12}$$

Equations (10) and (12) have been written for completeness and also for clarifying the relation between the set (1) and the Schrödinger equation for a bound state.

Taking advantage of the relativistic covariance of (1) and (7,8) one may solve them in the rest frame and write their solutions in any other frame simply by replacing any scalar product $\vec{p}_i \cdot \vec{p}_j$ by its Lorentz covariant expression $-p_i^{T\mu} \cdot p_{j\mu}^T = \frac{1}{M^2}(P \cdot p_i)\ (P \cdot p_j) - (p_i \cdot p_j)$.

We recall that equation (7) with the solution (9) and $\mathcal{U}_0$ a relativistic scattering kernel [2], [3] and/or a suitable confining potential [4], [5], [6] represent the starting point for most relativistic quark models. In all these cases dynamics is restricted to the relative coordinate. Our approach is more general. The relative motion does not have a special significance and the quarks can be really treated as independent particles. This makes a generalization of the set (1) to the baryon case very easy by including the contribution of a third quark momentum and writing the suitable relativistic coupling of spins and angular momenta.

The relation between the Bethe Salpeter formalism and the present approach also becomes clear by looking at their solutions written as perturbative series with respect to the interaction term. In the BS formalism the solution writes with the aid of relativistic Green functions having poles at positive and negative energies. This makes the number of particles in the intermediate states to be indefinite and causes a lot of trouble. In our case the perturbative series must be written for the relativistic invariant equation

$$(P_\mu p_1^\mu + P_\mu p_2^\mu + P_\mu \Omega^\mu)\Psi(p_1, p_2; P)\chi_S(\vec{p}_1, \vec{p}_2) = M^2 \Psi(p_1, p_2; P)\chi_S(\vec{p}_1, \vec{p}_2) \qquad (13)$$

which has been derived from the set (1) and coincides with (7) in the meson rest frame. Its Green function is Lorentz invariant and has only positive energy poles. This makes the perturbative series to resemble the series in nonrelativistic quantum mechanics and the number of particles to be the same in the external and intermediate states.

We analyse now the way one can use the solutions of the set (1) to obtain a suitable representation of a meson in terms of independent quark operators. It is obvious that a meson is not an ensemble of free quarks with the momentum distribution $\Psi_S(p_1, p_2; P)$ because the sum of the free quark 4-momenta does not coincide with the bound state 4-momentum. In order to have a real dynamical representation of the bound state the contribution of the operators Ω^μ to the meson momentum must also be included.

The solution we found to this problem is to write the contribution of the operators Ω^μ as the 4-momentum of an independent component of the meson existing besides the valence quarks [8]. To this end we introduce the notation

$$\Omega^\mu \Psi(p_1, p_2; P)\chi_S(\vec{p}_1, \vec{p}_2) = (P^\mu - p_1^\mu - p_2^\mu) \int d^4Q\ \varphi(p_1, p_2; Q) \sum_{s_1, s_2} \bar{u}_{s_1}(\vec{p}_1)\Gamma_S v_{s_2}(\vec{p}_2)$$
$$= \int d^4Q\ Q^\mu\ \varphi(p_1, p_2; Q) \sum_{s_1, s_2} \bar{u}_{s_1}(\vec{p}_1)\Gamma_S v_{s_2}(\vec{p}_2). \qquad (14)$$

where Γ_S is a suitable tensor product of γ matrices and quark momenta. The single meson state is written then as follows:

$$|M_i(P)\rangle = \int d^3p_1\ \frac{m_1}{e_1} d^3p_2 \frac{m_2}{e_2} d^4Q\ \delta^{(4)}(p_1 + p_2 + Q - P)$$

$$\times\varphi(p_1,p_2;Q)\sum_{s_1,s_2}\bar{u}_{s_1}(\vec{p}_1)\Gamma_S v_{s_2}(\vec{p}_2)\ \Phi^\dagger(Q)\ a^\dagger_{s_1}(\vec{p}_1)b^\dagger_{s_2}(\vec{p}_2)|0\rangle \tag{15}$$

where $a^\dagger$ and $b^\dagger$ are quark and antiquark creation operators and u, v are free Dirac spinors. $\Phi^\dagger$ is a vacuum-like effective field carrying the momentum $Q^\mu = P^\mu - p_1^\mu - p_2^\mu$ defined in the relation (14). According to its definition the field Φ represents the collective, time averaged effect of all the virtual excitations responsible for the binding and as such it must be compared with the "bag" in bag models [7]. We notice however that the bag has positive potential energy characterized by a constant volume density B, while the effective field Φ carries the 4-momentum Q^μ whose values are *a priori* limited only by the quark and meson mass shell constraints. (see eq. (15).) The existence of a momentum $\vec{Q}$ besides the energy component Q_0 may be considered the consequence of the imperfect cancellation of the vector momenta in the virtual processes generating the binding and is in agreement with the opinion that the potential is the average effect of a continuous series of quantum fluctuations.

The relativistic equivalent of eq.(12) is now the orthonormality relation for the single meson state (15). We calculate it in the general case by using the commutation relations for the free quark operators and assuming the following expression for the vacuum expectation value of the effective field:

$$\langle 0|\ \Phi(Q_1)\ \Phi^+(Q_2)\ |0\rangle\ = \frac{1}{L_0^3 T_0}\ \int d^4\ X\ \mathrm{e}^{i\ (Q_2-Q_1)_\mu\ X^\mu} = \frac{(2\pi)^4}{L_0^3 T_0}\ \delta^{(4)}(Q_1 - Q_2) \tag{16}$$

where L_0 is the range of the binding forces and T is a time sensibly larger than the time basis involved in the definition of the effective field.

We notice that $\delta(Q_0 - Q_0')$ in (16) induces a cumbersome $\delta(E - E')$ in the expression of the norm. In order to avoid it by preserving the manifest Lorentz covariance of eq. (16) we write

$$\frac{2\pi}{T_0}\ \delta(Q_0 - Q_0') = \frac{1}{T_0}\int_T dX_0\ \mathrm{e}^{i(E(P)-E(P'))X_0} \approx \frac{E}{MT_0}\int_{T_0} dY_0 \mathrm{e}^{i(M-M')Y_0} \approx \frac{E}{M}\ \delta_{MM'} \tag{17}$$

and get immediately:

$$\langle\ \mathcal{M}'(P')\ |\mathcal{M}(P)\ \rangle\ = 2E\ (2\pi)^3\ \delta^{(3)}(P - P')\ \delta_{MM'}\ \mathcal{J} \tag{18}$$

where

$$\mathcal{J} = \ \frac{1}{2M\ L_0^3}\ \int d^3p_1\ \frac{m_1}{e_1}\ d^3p_2\ \frac{m_2}{e_2}\ d^4Q\ \delta^{(4)}(p_1 + p_2 + Q - P)|\varphi(p_1,p_2;Q)|^2$$
$$\times Tr\left(\frac{\hat{p}_1 + m_1}{2m_1}\ \Gamma_S\ \frac{-\hat{p}_2 + m_2}{2m_2}\ \Gamma_{S'}\right) = 1. \tag{19}$$

In the above relations we have implicitly assumed that M and M' are discrete eigenvalues of the equation (7) with $|M - M'|\ T_0 >> 1$ and hence the integral in (17) vanishes if $M \neq M'$. Notice the remarkable fact that $\mathcal{J}$ does not depend on the rather arbitrary time T_0.

In the same way as above it can be shown that the expression of the norm will contain the highly singular factor $\delta(\alpha-\alpha')\delta^3(0)$ if $\vec{\Omega}$ vanishes in (7) i.e. if $Q^\mu=\alpha P^\mu$ where α is a scalar.

Relation (18) shows that the bound state function of the many particle system representing the meson can be normalized like that of a single particle if the integral $\mathcal{J}$ converges.

We expect for the internal function $\varphi(p_1,p_2;P)\ \bar{u}_{s_1}(\vec{p}_1)\Gamma_S v_{s_2}(\vec{p}_2)$ which represents an equilibrium distribution of spins and momenta in the bound system to have a stationary counterpart in the coordinate space which must coincide in the nonrelativistic limit with the internal wave function of the meson. Proceeding like in the BS formalism we define the meson wave function in coordinate space

$$\tilde{\varphi}(\vec{x},\vec{y},\vec{X},t;P)=\langle 0|\ \bar{\psi}(\vec{x},t)\Gamma_{S'}\psi(\vec{y},t)\Phi(\vec{X},t)|\mathcal{M}(\vec{P},E)\rangle \tag{20}$$

where the single meson state is given by (15), ψ is the quark field

$$\psi(\vec{x},t)=\frac{1}{(2\pi)^3}\sum_s\int d^3p\ \frac{m}{e_p}\left(b^\dagger_{\vec{p},s}\ v(\vec{p},s)\ \mathrm{e}^{ie_pt-\vec{p}\vec{x}}+a_{\vec{p},s}\ u(\vec{p},s)\ \mathrm{e}^{-ie_pt+i\vec{p}\vec{x}}\right) \tag{21}$$

and

$$\Phi(\vec{X},t;Q_0)=\frac{\sqrt{L_0^3T_0}}{(2\pi)^2}\int d^4Q\mathrm{e}^{-iQ_0t+\vec{Q}\vec{X}}\Phi(\vec{Q},Q_0). \tag{22}$$

After a straightforward calculation we get

$$\tilde{\varphi}(\vec{x},\vec{y},\vec{X},t;P)=\mathrm{e}^{-iEt+i\vec{P}\cdot\vec{X}}\ \tilde{\phi}(\vec{x},\vec{y},\vec{X};P) \tag{23}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\phi}(\vec{x},\vec{y},\vec{X};P)&=\frac{(2\pi)^2}{\sqrt{L_0^3T_0}}\int\frac{d^3p_1}{2e_1}\frac{d^3p_2}{2e_2}\\&\times Tr\left(\Gamma_S(\hat{p}_1+m_1)\Gamma_{S'}(-\hat{p}_2+m_2)\Gamma_S)\right)\varphi(p_1,p_2;P-p_1-p_2)\mathrm{e}^{i\vec{p}_1\cdot(\vec{x}-\vec{X})}\mathrm{e}^{i\vec{p}_2\cdot(\vec{y}-\vec{X})}\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

describes the internal meson structure in coordinate space.

At the first sight the expression (24) does not coincide with the usual internal wave function of a bound state because of its dependence on the coordinate $\vec{X}$ associated to the effective field which has no classical equivalent. However, in the nonrelativistic limit $\tilde{\phi}$ writes as:

$$\tilde{\phi}(\vec{x},\vec{y},\vec{X};P)=\delta^{(3)}(\vec{X}-\frac{\vec{x}+\vec{y}}{2})\tilde{\phi}_0(\vec{x},\vec{y};P) \tag{25}$$

if φ depends on the relative momentum $\vec{p}_1-\vec{p}_2$ only. Here ϕ_0 is really the internal wave function in nonrelativistic quantum mechanics because it represents the Fourier transform of the nonrelativistic momentum distribution function.

Concluding this paper we remark that the present approach provides a relativistic nonperturbative solution of the bound state problem. The main differences from the older relativistic approaches are the covariant generalization of the time independent Schrödinger equation accompanied by the introduction of a 4-vector quasipotential and the the definition of an effective field as an additional, independent constituent of the bound system besides the valence quarks. The 4-momentum of the effective field represents the contribution of the interaction term to the hadron momentum. The solutions of the dynamical equations (1) define equilibrium distributions of quark spins and momenta inside hadrons and hence may be directly used to calculate electroweak formfactors in the soft limit where binding effects are important.

Acknowledgements This work was initiated during author's visit in 1998 at the Institute of Theoretical Physics of the University of Bern. The author thanks Prof. Heiri Leutwyler for hospitality and stimulating discussions.

References

[1] E. E. Salpeter and H. A. Bethe, Phys. Rev. 84 (1951) 1232.

[2] A. A. Logunov and A. N. Tavkhelidze, Nuovo Cim. 29 (1963) 380; V. G. Kadyshevsky, Nucl. Phys. **B 6**, (1968) 125.

[3] Y. Nambu and G. Jona-Lasinio, Phys. Rev. 122 (1961) 345; *ibidem* 124 (1961) 246.

[4] A. P. Martynenko and R. N. Faustov, Teor. Mat. Fiz. 64 (1985) 179.

[5] S. Godfrey and N. Isgur, Phys. Rev. D 32 (1985) 189.

[6] F. Gross and J. Milana, Phys.. Rev. D 43 (1991) 2401.

[7] A. Chodos, R. L. Jaffe, K. Johnson, C. B. Thorn and V. F. Weisskopf, Phys. Rev. D 9 (1974) 3471; A. Chodos, R. L. Jaffe, K. Johnson and C. B. Thorn, Phys. Rev. D 10 (1974) 2599; T. DeGrand, R. L. Jaffe, K. Johnson and J. Kiskis, Phys. Rev. D 12 (1975) 2060.

[8] D. Ghilencea and L. Micu, Phys. Rev. D 52 (1995) 1577; L. Micu, Phys. Rev. D 53 (1996) 5318; *ibidem* D 55 (1997) 4151.